

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are now pending in the application. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings and specification. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant respectfully notes that Applicant amended the title in the response filed on June 5, 2007. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mizutani et al. (U.S. P. G. Pub. No. 2002/0093480). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for a display system, comprising: an active matrix type display panel; a data driver that drives data lines of the display panel; and a scan driver that scans scan lines of the display panel. The data driver outputs a drive voltage corresponding to a predetermined gray scale value to the data lines during a second frame period that includes a second and subsequent frames. The second frame is the next frame after a first frame where a display stopping signal is input. The data driver then outputs a non-display voltage to the data lines after the frame period ends. The scan driver outputs a selecting voltage to the scan lines and scans the scan lines during

a first frame period of the first frame and the second frame period. The scan driver outputs a non-selecting voltage to all of the scan lines after the second frame period ends. Finally, the data driver and the scan driver are set to a sleep mode when a predetermined frame period elapsed after the second frame period ends if the display stopping signal is a sleep signal.

Claim 9 calls for similar subject matter.

Mizutani fails to show, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 9. The Examiner relies on FIG. 9 and FIG. 10. As best understood by Applicant, Mizutani appears to describe FIGS. 9 and 10 as alternative embodiments to each other. For example, the Examiner relies on pulses of whole-reset line 102 as shown in FIG. 9 to disclose the display stopping signal. FIG. 9 does not disclose that **the data driver outputs a non-display voltage**. In other words, it appears that the pulses of the whole-reset line 102 obviate the need for a non-display voltage.

In contrast, FIG. 10 describes an alternative embodiment that is absent of any teaching or suggestion of the whole-reset line 102. Instead, FIG. 10 discloses that source potential 11 outputs the alleged non-display voltage. FIG. 10 fails to disclose a relationship between this alleged non-display voltage and a display stopping signal input in a preceding frame. In other words, the Examiner's reliance on the whole-reset line 102 is improper because this structure is absent from the embodiment of FIG. 10.

Further, Applicant respectfully notes that even if the Examiner's combination of the embodiments of FIGS. 9 and 10 is proper, the whole reset line 102 does not appear to be a "display stopping signal" as claim 1 recites. For example, as described in Paragraph [0101] and shown in FIG. 8 of Mizutani, the whole reset line 102, when

pulsed, drives pixel electrodes 1b to a ground potential, "thus resetting the voltages of the pixel electrodes 1b...to provide a black display state." Applicant respectfully submits that resetting voltages of pixel electrodes is not analogous to stopping the display. Fig. 9 of Mizutani does not stop display operation.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 9, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani et al. (U.S. P. G. Pub. No. 2002/0093480) in view of Glen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,083). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Applicant respectfully submits that Mizutani fails to show, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. The Examiner relies on Glen merely to disclose additional limitations not present in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Glen fails to make up for the deficiencies of Mizutani.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 5, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claims 1 and 9.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 8, 2008

By: _____


G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/pvd]